

Remarks

Claims 1-10, 12-15, and 21-28 are pending in the present application. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Furthermore, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration and allowance are requested in view of the above amendments and the remarks below.

Claims 1-10, 12-15, and 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Chu et al (U.S. Pub. 2004/0239683), hereafter “Chu.”

It should be noted that the Examiner has presented an improper rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102. Specifically, throughout the rejection, the Examiner uses language that implies an alleged “obviousness” of many of the features set forth in the claims; it appears that the Examiner should have presented a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103. For example, with regard to independent claim 1, the Examiner alleges that “it will be recognized by those skill in the art that the shape and the location of the popup window may be varied according to the design choice of designers and computer programmer using such a popup wi[n]dow to be displayed any where within the window.” As is clearly set forth in MPEP 2144.03, “Reliance on Common Knowledge in the Art or ‘Well Known’ Prior Art,” this type of rationale should be used by an Examiner to support a rejection under 35 U.S. C. 103. To this extent, Applicants request a clarification of the

Examiner's position.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Chu is defective because Chu fails to disclose each and every feature set forth in the claims as required by 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

Independent claim 1 recites:

“A method for providing a compact interface for display of an object hierarchy having a plurality of levels, comprising:

displaying a first level root node of the object hierarchy and navigation indicia indicating that the first level root node includes at least one second level child node in a first window;

upon selection of the first level root node in the first window, displaying a pop-up window that includes a listing of all second level child nodes of the first level root node immediately adjacent and to a right side of the first level root node in the first window; and

selecting one of the second level child nodes from the listing of all second level child nodes included in the pop-up window;

wherein, upon selection of one of the second level child nodes, the pop-up window that includes the listing of all second level child nodes of the first level root node disappears from the first window, and is replaced by the selected second level child node, which is displayed immediately adjacent and to the right side of the first level root node in the first window, wherein the first level root node, the navigation indicia, and the selected second level child node are displayed in a linear horizontal arrangement in the first window, and wherein a depth of a navigation path through the object hierarchy increases from left to right in the first window.”

Regarding independent claim 1, Chu fails to disclose, *inter alia*, the features of “upon selection of the first level root node, displaying a **pop-up window** that includes a listing of all second level child nodes of the first level root node immediately **adjacent and to a right side** of the first level root node in the first window,” “selecting one of the second level child nodes from the listing of all second level child nodes included in the pop-up window, “ and “wherein, upon selection of one of the second level child nodes, the pop-up window that includes the listing of all second level child nodes of the first level root node disappears from the first window, and is replaced by the selected second level child node, which is displayed immediately adjacent and to the right side of the first level root node in the first window, wherein the first level root node, the navigation indicia, and the selected second level child node are displayed in a linear horizontal arrangement in the first window, and wherein a depth of a navigation path through the object hierarchy increases from left to right in the first window.”

As admitted by the Examiner, Chu fails to disclose the claimed relative positioning of the first level root node, pop-up window, and second level child node. Such positioning (e.g., in a “linear horizontal arrangement”) provides a very compact interface for the display and navigation of object hierarchies. Chu, however, as evidenced throughout the figures, is directed toward the control of tree diagrams, which are clearly not provided in the claimed “linear horizontal arrangement.”

The Examiner appears to allege that the display of Chu’s dialog box 97

corresponds to the claimed feature of “upon selection of the first level root node in the first window, displaying a pop-up window that includes a listing of all second level child nodes of the first level root node immediately adjacent and to a right side of the first level root node in the first window.” This is incorrect. On the contrary, Chu’s dialog box 97 is not displayed “immediately adjacent and to a right side of the first level root node in the first window” (i.e., the dialog box 97 creates a less compact interface). Further, Chu’s dialog box 97 does not display a “listing of all second level child nodes of the first level root node.” Instead, Chu’s dialog box 97 displays **all** sibling and ancestor nodes between a selected node and the root node. For example, as depicted in FIG. 8A of Chu, selection of the node “D4.JAVA 67” results in the display of the dialog box 97 shown in FIG. 8C, which displays sibling nodes (e.g., D3.JAVA 66, D3. JAVA 65, etc.) and ancestor nodes (e.g., DATABASE 53, DATABASE 52, UTILITIES 51, etc.), all the way back to the root node (COM 21).

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is allowable. Further, Applicants submit that independent claims 9 and 21 are allowable for reasons similar to those set forth with regard to independent claim 1.

With respect to the dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features. For example, regarding dependent claims 5-7, 13-15, and 25-27, Chu fails to disclose the

selection of a node and the display of a pop-window, containing siblings of the selected node, **over the selected node**.

If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/ John A. Merecki /

Dated: October 17, 2007

John A. Merecki
Reg. No. 35,812

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, NY 12207
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile